

## Remarks

While Applicants believe that their arguments previously raised during prosecution sufficiently distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, Applicants have submitted amended claims that further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

In the final Office Action dated November 2, 2005, the Office suggests that the art of record does not show the method of translation claimed by Applicants for use in a testimonial proceeding. However, the Office notes that the prior version of the claim did not include any language specifically requiring a "court reporter." As such, Applicants have amended to claim to more specifically identify a court reporter, as suggested by the Office. In light of this amendment, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner should feel free to contact the undersigned attorney if he has any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Ronald Spuhler  
Ronald H. Spuhler  
Registration No. 52,245  
Attorney for Applicants  
500 West Madison Street  
34th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
(312) 775-8133

Date: March 2, 2006